# <u>Committee Name</u>: Assembly Committee – Rural Affairs and Forestry (AC–RAF)

## **Appointments**

99hr\_AC-RAF\_Appt\_pt00

## **Committee Hearings**

99hr\_AC-RAF\_CH\_pt00

## **Committee Reports**

99hr\_AC-RAF\_CR\_pt00

## Clearinghouse Rules

99hr\_AC-RAF\_CRule\_99-

## **Executive Sessions**

99hr\_AC-RAF\_ES\_pt00

# Hearing Records 99hr\_ab0092\_pt03

99hr\_sb0000

#### Misc.

99hr\_AC-RAF\_Misc\_\_pt00

#### **Record of Committee Proceedings**

99hr\_AC-RAF\_RCP\_pt00

4-22-99 PH AB127, AB150,AB198,Exec AB92,AB104,AB150

# Vote Record

# Assembly Committee on Rural Affairs and Forestry

Date:  Moved by AB: AB: SB: SB: AJR: SJR: A: SR: A/S Amdt:	Seconded by: Clearinghouse Rule: Appointment: Other:	
A/S Amdf: to A/S Amdf:  A/S Sub Amdf: to A/S Sub Amdf:  A/S Amdf: to A/S Sub Amdf  A/S Amdf: to A/S Amdf!  Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection  The Adoption and Adoption Rejection	Indefinite Postpo	
Committee Member Rep. John Ainsworth, Chair Rep. Terry Musser Rep. Kitty Rhoades Rep. Stephen Freese Rep. Judith Klusman Rep. Mary Hubler Rep. Barbara Gronemus Rep. Donald Hasenohrl Rep. Gary Sherman  Totals:	Aye No  O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Absent Not Voting

Motion Carried Motion Failed

# Vote Record

# Assembly Committee on Rural Affairs and Forestry

Date: WWW Trill G	l l	Seconded by:	Hubler
AB: 4V		Clearinghouse Rule:	
AB: SB:		Appointment:	
AJR: SJR: SR: SR:		Other:	
A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Sub Amdt: A/S Amdt:	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amdt	·	
A/S Amdt:	to A/S Amdt:		_ to A/S Sub Amdt:
Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection		Indefinite Postpone Tabling Concurrence Nonconcurrence Confirmation	ement
Committee Member Rep. John Ainsworth, Chair Rep. Terry Musser Rep. Kitty Rhoades Rep. Stephen Freese Rep. Judith Klusman Rep. Mary Hubler Rep. Barbara Gronemus Rep. Donald Hasenohrl Rep. Gary Sherman	Totals:		Absent Not Voting

# Vote Record

# Assembly Committee on Rural Affairs and Forestry

Date:		Seconded by: Clearinghouse Rule: Appointment: Other:	Hubler
A/S Amdt: 4// A/S Amdt: 4// A/S Sub Amdt: 4// A/S Amdt: 4// A// A// Amdt: 4// A// A// Amdt: 4// A// A// A// A// A// A// A// A// A//	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amdt to A/S Amdt:		to A/S Sub Amdt:
Berrecommended for: Passage - W	d	Indefinite Postpo	
Committee Member Rep. John Ainsworth, Chair Rep. Terry Musser Rep. Kitty Rhoades Rep. Stephen Freese Rep. Judith Klusman Rep. Mary Hubler Rep. Barbara Gronemus Rep. Donald Hasenohrl Rep. Gary Sherman	Totals:		Absent Not Voting

Motion Carried

Motion Failed

# Committee Meeting Attendance Sheet

# Assembly Committee on Rural Affairs and Forestry

Date: <u>April 22, 1999</u> Meetin Location: <u>328 Northwest - S</u>	g Type:	Public +	tearing	
Location: 328 Northwest - S	hate Cap	itol	$\sim$	
Committee Member Rep. John Ainsworth, Chair Rep. Terry Musser Rep. Kitty Rhoades Rep. Stephen Freese Rep. Judith Klusman Rep. Mary Hubler Rep. Barbara Gronemus Rep. Donald Hasenohrl	*	Present	Absent	Excused
Rep. Gary Sherman		$\square$		
7	Totals:	1	0	$\nu$

lutur hardne-

Kristina Boardman, Committee Clerk

# Committee Meeting Attendance Sheet

# Assembly Committee on Rural Affairs and Forestry

Date: April 22, 1999 Meet	ing Type:	Executi	ve Sessi	ion
Location: 328 Northwest	- State	Capitol		
Committee Member Rep. John Ainsworth, Chair Rep. Terry Musser Rep. Kitty Rhoades Rep. Stephen Freese Rep. Judith Klusman Rep. Mary Hubler Rep. Barbara Gronemus Rep. Donald Hasenohrl Rep. Gary Sherman		Present  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D	Absent	Excused
	Totals:	1	0	$_{-}v_{-}$

Kristina Boardman, Committee Clerk



## WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF MEMORANDUM

One East Main Street, Suite 401; P.O. Box 2536; Madison, WI 53701-2536 Telephone: (608) 266-1304

Fax: (608) 266-3830 Email: leg.council@legis.state.wi.us

DATE:

March 30, 1999

TO:

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN AINSWORTH, CHAIRPERSON; AND

MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON RURAL AFFAIRS

AND FORESTRY

FROM:

Gordon A. Anderson, Senior Staff Attorney

SUBJECT:

1999 Assembly Bill 92 and Proposed Assembly Substitute Amendment \_\_\_\_

(LRBs0021/1)

This memorandum describes 1999 Assembly Bill 92 and the changes made in the bill by proposed Assembly Substitute Amendment \_\_\_ (LRBs0021/1).

## A. 1992 ASSEMBLY BILL 92

Current law penalizes a person who intentionally releases an animal that is "lawfully confined" for scientific, farming, restocking, research, exhibition, commercial, educational, recreational, companionship or security purposes, if the owner or custodian of the animal has not consented to the release of the animal. Penalties vary depending on whether the person has previously violated the law. For a first violation (a "Class C misdemeanor"), the penalty is a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days or both; for a second violation (a "Class A misdemeanor"), a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than nine months or both; and for a third or subsequent violation (a "Class E felony"), a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than \$10,000 or imprisonme

Also under current s. 973.075, Stats., certain property connected to criminal activity is subject to forfeiture to the state. Among the categories of property that may be forfeited to the state under s. 973.075 (1) (b), Stats., are vehicles used to transport any property or weapon used or to be used or received in the commission of a felony, or a vehicle used in the commission of certain other specified crimes.

Under Assembly Bill 92, the maximum penalties for violating the prohibition against intentionally releasing an animal are increased, for certain categories of animals, to provide that

the violation is a "Class C felony" which is punishable by a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both, if the offense occurs before December 31, 1999, or a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 15 years or both if the offense occurs on or after that date. The changes are applicable to persons who intentionally release an animal that is lawfully confined for *scientific*, *farming*, *restocking*, *research* or *commercial* purposes.

The bill does not change the penalties for releasing animals confined for exhibition, educational, recreational, companionship or security purposes.

The bill also provides that any vehicle or any other property that is used or will be used to violate the prohibitions against intentionally releasing animals will be subject to forfeiture to the state.

Under current s. 895.57 (2), Stats., a person who intentionally releases an animal that is lawfully confined is liable to the owner or custodian for damages which include costs of restoring the animal to confinement. The bill adds punitive damages, attorney fees and interest on the amount of the damages from the date of release.

The bill also provides immunity from civil liability to the owner or custodian of a confined animal for damages suffered by a person if the person suffers the damages while violating or attempting to violate the law and if the damages are caused by any "security device," including a guard dog, that the owner or custodian of a confined animal installs or uses if he or she reasonably believes that the security device is necessary to protect a confined animal or the premises containing a confined animal. The bill provides that it is not reasonable to install or use a security device that is intended or is likely to cause death or great bodily harm for the purpose of protecting a confined animal or the premises containing a confined animal. If the owner or custodian of a confined animal uses a dog as a security device, the owner or custodian is entitled to immunity only if the dog is on the owner's or custodian's property at the time it causes the damages.

# B. PROPOSED ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT — (LRBs0021/1)

Proposed Assembly Substitute Amendment \_\_\_ (LRBs0021/1) is identical to the original bill in its provisions relating to the penalties for release of the animals. It changes only the provisions relating to immunity from liability for unauthorized release of animals.

The proposed substitute amendment provides that an owner or custodian of a confined animal is immune from civil liability for any damages to a person who suffers the damages while violating or attempting to violate the statutory prohibitions against release of animals. It further provides that an owner or custodian of an animal that is released in violation of the law is immune from liability for any damages caused by that released animal. It provides that the immunity does not apply if the injury was caused by a security device that is intended or likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you have any questions or I can be of further assistance, please let me know.